



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,503	12/20/1999	GREGORY MAURICE PLOW	ST999007/128	2479

7590 01/22/2003

JOSEPH A SAWYER JR  
SAWYER & ASSOCIATES  
P O BOX 51418  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/467,503	PLOW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21-29, 31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21-29, 31 and 32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is response to Amendment A, filed 11/26/2002.

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32 were amended, and claims 10, 20 and 30 were cancelled. This action is made Final.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The corrected claims 31 and 32 were received on 11/26/2002. Examiner withdraws the 35 USC 112 rejections on claims 31 and 32 of the last office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaaskelainen, Jr. (US #6,002,397) in view of Diedrichsen et al (“Diedrichsen”, US #5,920,313).

As per independent claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches a method for displaying hidden information on a display screen, the display screen displaying a plurality of application windows, a first window of the plurality of application windows obscuring the hidden information within a

second window of the plurality of application windows (fig. 2A; from col. 4, lines 64-67 through col. 5, lines 1-12), comprising the steps of:

creating a viewport as a topmost window in response to a first user interaction (*window hatch 110*; fig. 2B; col. 5, lines 12-27 and lines 35-41);

Jaaskelainen, Jr. does not disclose the viewport includes a minimize all button. According to Diedrichsen, the OS/2 Workplace developed by International Business Machines Corporation features the use of collections of related windows (work area) whose behavior is coordinated. If the user minimizes a work area all windows opened from an object in that work area are removed from the desktop; if a user restores a work area, all windows that were open when the work area was closed are restored to their previous positions (col. 2, lines 11-18). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Diedrichsen of the viewport includes a minimize all button in Jaaskelainen, Jr.'s method since it would be a faster process of minimizing all windows.

associating the second application window with the viewport in response to a second user interaction; displaying the hidden information in the viewport whenever the viewport is positioned over the hidden information (fig. 2B; col. 5, lines 26-35).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches a third application window obscures the hidden information within the second window (fig. 2A; from col. 4, lines 64-67 through col. 5, lines 1-12).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches displaying the hidden information in the viewport includes displaying a portion of the hidden information (fig. 2B; col. 5, lines 26-35).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches creating a viewport as a topmost window in response to a first user interaction includes providing an application viewport tool (col. 5, lines 50-55 and col. 6, lines 6-13).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of:

relocating the viewport wherein a first portion of the display occupied by the viewport and displaying the hidden information is restored to a normal display of the first application window upon moving the viewport to a second portion of the display that is not contiguous with the first portion (col. 5, lines 51-55); it is inherent in Jaaskelainen's system that when the window hatch is repositioned to the second portion of the display that is not contiguous with the first portion, the display (in the first portion) occupied by the window hatch and displaying the hidden information is restored to a normal display of the first application window.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of:

capturing the hidden information displayed within the viewport wherein the hidden information displayed within the viewport becomes invariant in response to a user interaction (col. 12, lines 35-41).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising the steps of.

relocating the viewport from a first portion of the display to a second portion of the display; continuing to display the invariant hidden information within the viewport (col. 12, lines 35-41).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the viewport can be resized (col. 10, lines 26-33).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the viewport includes a plurality of viewports (fig. 2E; col. 6, lines 22-27).

As per independent claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 26, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 31, it is a similar scope to claim 1 and 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 32, it is a similar scope to claim 1 and 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

#### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-29, 31 and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as above.

#### *Conclusion*

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Inquires***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen  
January 10, 2003

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100